ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Bradshaw International, Inc. v. 石军 (shijun), 旦唐春 (dantangchun), 旦唐春 (dan tangchun)
Case No. D2026-3838

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bradshaw International, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Winston Taylor LLP, United States.

The Respondents are 石军 (shijun), China; and 旦唐春 (dantangchun), 旦唐春 (dan tangchun), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <goodcookbakeware.com> is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain name <goodcookonline.com> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation.

Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd. and Xin Net Technology Corporation are separately and jointly referred to below as the "Registrar".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 27, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondents (Registrations Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 7, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on September 11, 2026.

On September 7, 2026, the Center also informed the Parties, in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <goodcookonline.com> is Chinese. On September 11, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 4, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy, Sally M. Abel and Jacob Changjie Chen as panelists in this matter on October 21, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of the Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a designer, manufacturer and distributor of kitchenware products. It owns multiple United States trademark registrations, including registration number 4764932 for GOODCOOK, registered on June 30, 2015, specifying goods in classes 8, 9, 11, 16, and 20, with claims of first use in commerce in March 2013. That trademark registration is current. The Complainant offers its goods for sale at, among other places, the Amazon marketplace, where it offers its bakeware, cookware, tools and gadgets, and food storage products.

The Respondents are identified as two individuals based in China.

The disputed domain name <goodcookbakeware.com> was registered on December 26, 2025 and its registrant is 石军 (shijun).. The disputed domain name <goodcookonline.com> was registered on February 6, 2026 and its registrant is 旦唐春 (dantangchun), 旦唐春 (dan tangchun). Both disputed domain names resolve to websites that prominently display the GOODCOOK mark and purportedly offer for sale bakeware, cookware, tools and gadgets, and food storage products. According to evidence presented by the Complainant, both websites reproduce product images from the Complainant's Amazon marketplace storefront. Prices are shown in USD. The website footers identify the operator of the website associated with the disputed domain name <goodcookbakeware.com> as "GoodCook" while the website associated with the disputed domain name <goodcookonline.com> is described as a "GoodCook Official Online Shop".[1]

[1] The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited the websites associated with the disputed domain names to verify the Complainant's claims regarding those websites. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it has registered and common law rights in its GOODCOOK marks. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to those marks.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not authorized users of the Complainant's GOODCOOK marks. The Respondents are not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Respondents use the disputed domain names and have maintained their registrations in bad faith. The Respondents registered the disputed domain names primarily to disrupt the Complainant's business, impersonate the Complainant, and solicit payments from the Complainant's customers, each in bad faith. The disputed domain names operate as phishing and brand impersonation schemes, using the Complainant's GOODCOOK marks, content, and overall brand impersonation to solicit consumer purchases that consumers never receive. The Respondents are scamming consumers by undercutting prices and collecting payment information, while never actually delivering the advertised goods. The Respondents' use of the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant is a fraudulent act and constitutes bad faith use.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names are both composed according to the pattern "goodcook+[word].com" and were both registered within a relatively short period of six weeks of each other. They resolve to websites that both prominently display the GOODCOOK mark and identical product menu categories, offering substantially the same goods, and sharing virtually identical information pages (i.e., About Us, Contact Us, Privacy Policy, and Refund and Returns policy). In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds it likely that the disputed domain names and the associated websites are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <goodcookonline.com> is Chinese while the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <goodcookbakeware.com> is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the content of the websites associated with both disputed domain names is in English. Additionally, the Complainant would be prejudiced by the time and costs of translating the Complaint and supporting evidence.

Despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding, and the notification of the Complaint, in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or express any interest in otherwise participating in this proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown that it holds registered trademark rights in respect of the GOODCOOK mark, among others, for the purposes of the Policy. That trademark registration is current. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1. Given that finding, it is unnecessary to consider the Complainant's claim of common law rights.

The entirety of the GOODCOOK mark is reproduced within each disputed domain name. Despite the addition of the word "bakeware" or "online", the mark is clearly recognizable within each disputed domain name. The only other element in each disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name <goodcookonline.com> combines the GOODCOOK mark with the word "online", which has an inherent Internet connection and creates a risk of implied affiliation. The disputed domain name <goodcookbakeware.com> combines the GOODCOOK mark with the word "bakeware", which describes a category of the Complainant's products, and may also trigger an inference of affiliation. Both disputed domain names resolve to websites that prominently display the GOODCOOK mark and reproduce product images from the Complainant's Amazon marketplace storefront, purportedly offering those products for sale. One website is described as a "GoodCook Official Online Shop", while the operator of the other website is identified as "GoodCook". This all gives the false impression that the websites are operated by the Complainant. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that he is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. Further, prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation, as here, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Registrar has verified that the Respondent's personal names are "石军 (shijun)", and "旦唐春 (dantangchun), 旦唐春 (dan tangchun)", neither of which resembles either disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2025 and 2026, years after the registration of the Complainant's GOODCOOK mark. The disputed domain names wholly incorporate that mark, combining it simply with the word "online" or with the word "bakeware", which describes a category of the Complainant's goods, and a gTLD extension. The disputed domain names resolve to websites that prominently display the GOODCOOK mark, reproduce product images from the Complainant's Amazon marketplace storefront and purportedly offer those products for sale. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its mark when he registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, the disputed domain names resolve to websites that are falsely presented as the Complainant's websites, purportedly offering its kitchenware products for sale. Given the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of his website or of the products on that website, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation, as here, constitutes bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <goodcookbakeware.com> and <goodcookonline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/
Matthew Kennedy
Presiding Panelist

/Sally M. Abel/
Sally M. Abel
Panelist

/Jacob Changjie Chen/
Jacob Changjie Chen
Panelist
Date: October 26, 2026